

**REMARKS**

This Response, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated May 12, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested

Claims 1-33 are all the claims pending in the present application.

**I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 8, 17, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Safadi (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0126086).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

a server, wherein if the server receives multimedia contents from one of a plurality of DRM server groups having a unique DRM solution respectively, the server performs communication relating to services with the corresponding DRM server group according to the DRM solution of the received multimedia contents, converts the received multimedia contents into multimedia contents having a format suitable for at least one client of the intranet and transmits the converted multimedia contents to the client.

The Examiner asserts that Safadi teaches all of the elements of claim 1, citing paras.

[0017], [0021], [0023], [0026], and [0028] in support. Safadi discloses converting an original DRM scheme to a native DRM scheme which is compatible with a consumer device used to process content. Specifically, Safadi discloses a DRM proxy device receives requested content from content providers as if it were the consumer device. The processor can terminate an original DRM scheme and repackage the content with the native DRM scheme for secure delivery to the consumer device via the DRM proxy device.

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, there is no teaching or suggestion that the server performs communication relating to services with the corresponding DRM server group according to the DRM solution of the received multimedia contents. As discussed in Safadi, an original DRM scheme of a content is converted to a second "native" DRM scheme which is compatible with the consumer device that has requested the content.

Therefore, since Safadi does not teach or suggest that the server performs communication relating to services with the corresponding DRM server group according to the DRM solution of the received multimedia contents, Safadi does not anticipate claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. To the extent independent claims 8, 17 and 24 recite similar elements, claims 8, 17 and 24 and their dependent claims should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

## **II. Rejection of claims 2-4, 9-11, 18-20 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2-4, 9-11, 18-20 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safadi in view of Russ et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,748,080). Claims 2-4, 9-11, 18-20 and 25-27 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 8, 17 and 24 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Russ does not cure the deficiencies of Safadi.

### **Claim 2**

Claim 2 recites "wherein the converted multimedia contents are encrypted and transmitted to the client." The Examiner concedes that Safadi does not teach this aspect of the claim and cites Russ to cure the deficiency. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Russ, that converted multimedia contents, which are received multimedia contents converted into

multimedia contents having a format suitable for at least one client of the intranet, are encrypted and transmitted to the client, as claimed. Specifically, Russ is not concerned with converted multimedia contents as claimed.

Therefore, claim 2 should be deemed allowable. To the extent claims 9, 18 and 25 recite similar elements, claims 9, 18, and 25 should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

**III. Rejection of claims 5 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 5 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safadi in view of Russ and in view of Fransdonk (U.S. Patent No. 7,228,427). Claims 5 and 21 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1 and 17 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Russ and Fransdonk do not cure the deficiencies of Safadi.

**IV. Rejection of claims 6, 7, 12, 16, 22, 23, 28 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 6, 7, 12, 16, 22, 23, 28 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safadi in view of Russ and in view of Hans et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,200,575). Claims 6, 7, 12, 16, 22, 23, 28 and 32 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 8, 17 and 24 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Russ and Hans do not cure the deficiencies of Safadi.

**V. Rejection of claims 13-15 and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 13-15 and 29-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Safadi in view of Russ in view of Hans and in view of Fransdonk. Claims 13-15 and 29-33 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claims 8 and 24 for at least the

reasons set forth above. Moreover, Russ, Hans and Fransdonk do not cure the deficiencies of Safadi.

## **VI. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

---

Ruthleen E. Uy  
Registration No. 51,361

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 11, 2008